

Message

From: Makris, Susan [Makris.Susan@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/4/2015 9:55:39 PM
To: Glenn, Barbara [Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov]
CC: Kraft, Andrew [Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Dev/ Repro Formaldehyde- Lit Search
Attachments: List of 47 dev-repro animal studies 11-4-15.docx

Hi Barbara, I think I've finally figured it out! I've attached a table that includes all 47 references in the EndNote file from way back when. We had recognized that they included some non-inhalation studies, and there turned out to be other problems as well. I've now painstakingly matched the references to the text and to the study quality evaluation table (revised versions, which I will forward to you yet today). The attached table highlights the references (in yellow) that might be excluded for various reasons; I think there'll be 32 left. It's not always a straightforward decision. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to discuss the details with you. Sue

Susan Makris
USEPA/ORD/NCEA (8623P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460
Office: 703-347-8522
Fax: 703-347-8692
makris.susan@epa.gov

From: Glenn, Barbara
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 4:38 PM
To: Makris, Susan <Makris.Susan@epa.gov>
Subject: Dev/ Repro Formaldehyde- Lit Search

Hi Sue,
As you know I've been working on the literature search stuff this week. I think I have been able to get the numbers to make sense (up to a point) on the figure that combines the human and animals lit searches using an explanation that Mary wrote when she sent the endnote file to the HERO people and the endnote file itself. I have added our sorting of the 2013-2014 literature also.

I placed the categories into the bins; population, exposure, comparison, outcome and other. I have added these bin terms to our sorting categories in the endnote file so we know what went where.

Could you look at this and see if it makes sense to you? Also, in the endnote file, there is a category called "Considered animal studies" with 22 studies in there. Could you sort these (provide explanations for excluding?). I found a file where I had done that for the 78 human studies before. Is it correct that there are 47 studies in the document (prior to 2013-2014?).

In the figure, the red numbers in the full text screen box and the last box indicate the 2013-14 search.

We can sit and look at the figure and endnote file together if you want to better understand what is in there. My numbers don't add right going from full text screen to # included and my brain is too addled to try to count again.

Thanks! Barbara